CO-EDUCATION IN PRACTICE

BEING AN ADDRESS DELIVERED IN CAMBRIDGE IN FEBRUARY, 1914, WITH MANY ADDITIONS AND THREE APPENDICES

BY

J. H. BADLEY, M.A.

HEADMASTER OF BEDALES SCHOOL

W. HEFFER AND SONS, LTD., CAMBRIDGE
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL AND CO., LTD., LONDON
1914

Price One Shilling Net

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Early Collegiate Life: and other Papers. By JOHN VENN, Sc.D., F.R.S., F.S.A., President of Caius College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. viii + 286 pp. 5s. net. (Postage 4d.)

"His book is worthy of a place on the shelf which holds Mullinger and Mayor and Wordsworth, Gunning and Pryme and J. W. Clark, and this is high praise."—*Cambridge Magazine.*

A History of University Reform, from 1800 to the present time. With suggestions towards a complete scheme for the University of Cambridge. By A. I. TILLYARD, M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge. pp. xiv + 392. Demy 8vo. 10s. net. (Postage 5d.)

"Students of the history of English education and education reformers alike should welcome this book."—*Times.*

An Anthology of Cambridge Poets, 1900-1913. Selected by AELFRIDA TILLYARD. With an Introduction by Sir ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH, King Edward VII. Professor of English Literature, Cambridge University. pp. xvi + 226. Crown 8vo. Gilt top. 5s. net. (Postage 4d.)

". . . the strongest possible evidence of that renewed vitality of poetry which is one of the hopefulest signs of our day."—*Manchester Guardian.*

A Proper Newe Booke of Cokerye. A Reprint of an interesting Sixteenth Century Cookery Book. Edited, with Notes, Introduction, and Glossary, with some account of Domestic Life, Cookery and Feasts in Tudor Days, and of the first owners of the book—Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Margaret Parker, his wife—by CATHERINE FRANCES FRERE. Demy 8vo. Photogravure Frontispiece. pp. clxiv + 124. Grolieresque binding, designed by the Authoress. 7s. 6d. net. (Postage, 4d.)

"Fascinating."—*Times.* "Singularly interesting."—*Westminster.* "This delightful volume."—*Glasgow Herald.*

Perse Play Books. No. 4 First Fruits of the Play Method in Prose. With a preface by the HEADMASTER (Dr. Ronse), and an Essay on the method by H. CALDWELL COOK. Fscap 4to, x + 184 pp. 3s. net. (Postage 4d.)

"Mr. Caldwell Cook's system is that of encouragement as opposed to repression, and above all of self-government. His method of teaching literature and essay writing is admirable. . . . The book contains many examples from the work of boys varying in age from 10 to 15. . . . To any one conversant with the average essay produced by scholars of this age the contrast is exceedingly striking."—*Times.*

Elizabethan Drama and its Mad Folk. The Harness Prize Essay for 1913. By EDGAR ALLISON PEERS, B.A., Late Scholar of Christ's College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo, 200 pp. 3s. 6d. net. (Postage 4d.)

"We have no hesitation in saying that this is quite the best book yet written upon a subject which hitherto has not received the attention it deserves."—*Athenæum.*

"Mr. Peers' book is able and shrewd, his reading and enthusiasm not to be suspected."—*Saturday Review.*

Cambridge: W. HEFFER & SONS, LTD.
London: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL & CO., LTD.

CO-EDUCATION IN PRACTICE

BEING AN ADDRESS DELIVERED IN CAMBRIDGE IN FEBRUARY, 1914, WITH MANY ADDITIONS AND THREE APPENDICES

BY

J. H. BADLEY, M.A.

HEADMASTER OF BEDALES SCHOOL

W. HEFFER AND SONS, LTD., CAMBRIDGE
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL AND CO., LTD., LONDON
1914

NOTE.—What follows is the substance of an address given in Cambridge in February, 1914, to "The Heretics." A few additions have been made where it seemed necessary to amplify what then, owing to considerations of time, had to be left as bald statements; and a few omissions of introductory or incidental remarks proper only to the occasion. But no attempt has been made to alter the personal tone natural on the part of a speaker to an audience, especially when speaking chiefly of conclusions drawn from his own experience; nor to substitute for the personal pronoun the anonymity, more usual in cold print, of "the present writer."

In an Appendix is given a fuller statement of some of the facts that are merely outlined in the text.

J. H. B.

CO-EDUCATION IN PRACTICE.

I.

EVEN a few years ago anyone venturing to uphold the education of the sexes together through all the stages, from the nursery to the University, and to uphold it not merely as an abstract proposition, but as a practical possibility, in this country as in others, would have had to begin with an apology for taking up time in discussing what to most would have seemed a mere "fad" hardly worth serious consideration, a thing to be dismissed as impracticable, even if it were not also condemned as immoral. It is surprising, however, what a change there has been of recent years in the general attitude towards the question. When, for instance, 16 years or so ago I began to speak of co-education as a change for the better that I thought ripe for trial in my own school (up to that time of boys only), people used to listen in polite incredulity, or else to warn me that, if we adopted it, the school would soon be blown sky-high. Now, on the contrary, there are comparatively few who are not ready to admit that the common education of the sexes may possibly have its advantages, or at least are not willing to give the matter a fair hearing before pronouncing upon it. It is no longer necessary, in order to induce people to think of it as a

possibility, to remind them that boys and girls, with all their differences, are yet both of them human beings, with nine-tenths of their needs in common, and that nature has taken no precautions to separate them, at any stage of their growth, into different families. Elementary facts such as these, on which it was once necessary to insist, may now be taken for granted. We have reached the point at which it is generally conceded that the value or the unsuitability of co-education, as of any other far-reaching change, is a thing that cannot be proved one way or the other by abstract argument or by appeals to what is " in conformity with nature," or to (theoretically) inevitable results. The utmost that can be done by argument, we are agreed, is to decide whether the experiment is worth making, or too obviously remote from present needs and conditions even to attempt. For the rest, as with the homely pudding, the proof is in the eating,—and in the subsequent effects connected with digestion. In other words, for the outcome, good or bad, of co-education and the conditions requisite for its success, or at least those under which it is most reasonable to make the experiment, the appeal must be to experience. It is for those who have made the experiment, and especially for those who have made it in its completest form, to say what their experience has been as to its nature and results, and what, if it is to be more widely extended, seem to them to be the necessary conditions to enable this to be done with the fullest advantage. Of these things I venture to hope that what I have to say may be worth consideration, as coming from one who, for some 15 years, has been making the experiment on a completer scale, perhaps, than most others in this country. For while co-education is, of course, no new thing among children everywhere up to the age of 12, and, in

day schools, is much commoner up to the age of 16 than is usually supposed, one can still count on one hand the schools in which it is being tried in conditions similar to those of the Public Schools,—carried on, that is, up to the age of 18 or 19, and not during school hours merely, but throughout the entire life of a boarding school. It is under these conditions, and in its extremest form, that such experience as I have had of coeducation has been gained,—an experience, let me say at the outset, that, with every added year, makes me believe more and more in its value. Nor have the conditions, in one respect at least, been altogether of the easiest; for it was only after the School had been in existence for some years that we began the experiment by introducing half-a-dozen girls for the first time amongst some 60 boys of all ages;—a proceeding which, though I should still unhesitatingly adopt it if I had to make the choice again, I should certainly hesitate to recommend in all cases. Our numbers are now 125 boys and 75 girls, of ages varying, with both sexes alike, from 7 to 19. The inequality between the numbers is not simply accidental, or due only to the natural tendency to send boys away to school at an earlier age than girls; but it is maintained by deliberate intention on our part, in order to guard against a tendency not uncommon, unless guarded against, in mixed schools: namely, for the girls to stay on longer and become the larger number, which would soon lead to the boys being withdrawn after the preparatory school age is passed, and sent to other schools for boys alone, to the serious loss of both alike. We choose, therefore, to keep a somewhat larger proportion of boys of all ages, that there may be no ground for a tendency that would in the end be fatal to real co-education—a term greatly misapplied, and brought into deserved contempt, if used of a girls' school with

small boys in its lower classes. To these facts and figures (which I only mention as credentials for my right to speak of co-education at all) I may add that, in these fifteen years, something like 300 boys and girls have left the School after sharing its life together for a longer or shorter time; which will serve to show, if in what follows there may seem to be merely dogmatic statements, the range of experience on which any conclusions we have reached are based.

If, then, it is to experience that we must appeal to prove the possibility of co-education, and its value, or the contrary, what can one who has had some experience of it, under conditions such as have been outlined, contribute to the discussion of the question? In the first place, facts. In any such discussion there is usually no lack of theories and of hearsay evidence in support of the position the speaker has taken up. What is needed, rather than *a priori* arguments or judgments, for or against, is some account of the results of observation at first hand, and of theories that have been put to the test of actual practice. And amongst these results of observation and experience will naturally be the chief conclusions that we have found ourselves led to form, both with regard to the gains and difficulties that are involved in co-education, and their relative importance in estimating its value, and also as to the conditions upon which these gains and difficulties seem to us chiefly to depend. And, thirdly, as of course the personal element enters largely into these conclusions, and hardly less into the range of observation that constitutes one's experience, it seems necessary to give some statement of the grounds of that faith in co-education that led us first to try the experiment, and that, as I have said, has only grown stronger with the fuller knowledge of its difficulties and its gains.

II.

In any appeal to experience, it is helpful to know on how widely extended a scale the experiment has been made, and with what general results, in order to supply a wider background to merely individual experience and a means of correction for personal bias. Let me hasten to add that I am not going to ask the reader to follow me through the pages of a Blue Book. I do not propose to give columns of statistics as to the proportion of children in various countries in mixed and separate schools, or the rate of increase or decrease in the numbers of both. Such figures are seldom fully obtainable; if incomplete, they have little value, and even if complete they are apt to be misleading, as we all look at them from different points of view, and generally ignore most of the determining conditions on which their meaning depends. For those who want them, some facts and figures about the extent of co-education in Europe are given on a later page.* Here it is only necessary to give a brief summary of them, in order to show that co-education is not such a new and untried thing, even on this side of the Atlantic, as in discussion is often assumed. Because America is the example that we know best, and on the largest scale, both in the huge numbers of children there educated together, and and in the length of time that this has been the case, people are apt to speak of it as if it were the only example that we have; and if they can quote some evidence,—such as the scare-head that appeared, not long ago, in a New York daily: "Co-education is a failure; the Horace Mann School decides to abandon it"—that it is losing ground over there, both in numbers and, as they

---

* See Appendix I.

not unnaturally assume, in the public confidence, they suppose that they have proved it as good as dead, and can dismiss the subject as undeserving of further discussion. But such statements are not always to be taken at their face value. To show how misleading they may be, let me give a recent example that, as it was made in reference to our own country, could be more easily examined. In December last a writer in the *Times* Educational Supplement, dealing with education in Scotland, made the statement :—" Co-education has been eliminated where possible from Secondary Schools." In order to test the truth of this statement, a letter was addressed, by an enquirer interested in collecting information upon this subject, to the Clerk of the School Board and the Headmasters in each Scotch town of importance, and elicited (1) that 70 per cent. of the public secondary schools in Scotland are co-educational ; (2) that in three of the largest cities only is there a tendency to establish separate schools ; and (3) that the School Boards and Headmasters elsewhere are satisfied with the principle of mixed schools, and are extending them. If all such statements about the decline of co-education in America could be similarly investigated, they would probably have to be similarly discounted, and the decline that there is, undoubtedly, in some of the largest cities there would be found to have its cause in their special conditions. I have questioned many American teachers on the subject. Their answer is that we must realise that there are several Americas,—the Centre and the West, as well as the Eastern seaboard States, of which we hear most, and each with very different conditions. It is mainly in the great cities of these Eastern States that the decline of co-education is reported, and there it is largely a matter of class distinction. In New York, for example, the old co-educational public school

for all children alike, without distinction, is apt to break down owing to the growing unwillingness of the richer and more cultured parents to send their children to sit side by side with those of the lowest class immigrant from the most backward country in Europe. It is natural enough ; nor is it surprising that the demand for separate schools for the upper classes should also take the form of a demand for schools not of the national American type, but of the separate English Public School model. But this is a very different thing from a condemnation, as we are expected to think, of the whole of American co-education ; and while in the more sparsely populated West, co-education is partly a matter of necessity, it is also the deliberate choice of a more vigorous democracy that will not countenance the creation of differences of class or sex. I have never yet met a teacher from the Centre or West who did not express an enthusiastic belief in co-education for its own sake ; while the majority of those from the Eastern States deplore the results that they foresee from a tendency to separation that they feel to be due not so much to any distrust of co-education in itself as to differences in wealth and social position, and to present economic conditions in education that lead to excessive numbers in the city schools,* and the undue preponderance of women amongst the teachers. Considerations such as these should, I think, make us hesitate to accept assertions that co-education is on the decline in America as a whole, or that where, relatively, it is losing ground, this decline is due to disbelief in it, on its own merits, as the result of long experience. But, as I said at the outset, whatever bearing our knowledge of America and its varying conditions may have upon the subject, it is by no means the only country

---

* See Appendix II.

to which we can look for example or warning, for co-education has already been firmly established for a generation in Europe. I do not mean that it is to be found everywhere, still less that wherever it has found a footing it is always being fully, or even fairly, tried. But the results of a partial, or even of an ill-considered, experiment are sometimes of hardly less value, if only as showing us what to avoid, than those of an experiment more generously conducted. In Central and Southern Europe it is still young, and often viewed with a considerable amount of suspicion. In Germany, for instance, a limited number of girls are admitted, for purposes of instruction, into a large number of State Secondary Schools, but grudgingly and on sufferance. The only really co-educational schools—those, that is, in which the joint upbringing of boys and girls is one of their root principles, and carried out not only in the class-room, but in the whole school life—are schools of recent foundation, the outcome of an educational movement steadily growing in many countries, in which, while many of the "New Schools," as they are usually called, are, like the pioneer school in this country from which they spring, confined to boys only, others, like my own, have adopted co-education as a logical and necessary outcome of the movement. In the Latin countries one would hardly expect co-education to take root. In France an isolated experiment came to signal failure; but in Italy it is now, so far as common instruction goes, quite usual in secondary schools, especially in the North; and, most unexpected of all, for just a quarter of a century there has been a flourishing co-educational school in the Spanish capital. But it is in the North of Europe that it is commonest and most firmly rooted. In the three Scandinavian countries, and in Finland, after being put to the test

in private schools, it was adopted, about twenty years ago, in all the State schools, and so is now in these countries almost universal from the elementary school up to the University, a state of things in which some see an explanation of the fact that, in two of these countries, women already have their full share of political power. It was in Norway, perhaps I may be pardoned for adding, that, during a Cambridge Long Vacation, 27 years ago, thanks to the sprained ankle of one of our party, I first came into touch with co-education, and saw something of its results; and was so impressed by the delightful comradeship between the sexes that it had produced that I made up my mind then and there that what was possible in Norway ought surely to be possible in England, and that at least, if ever I had the chance, it should be tried in an English school.

And, lastly, in our own country co-education is neither of such recent introduction nor of such small extent as one is apt to think. In Scotland, as I have already shown, it is the rule rather than the exception, as the outcome partly of the Protestantism of the Reformers, who were determined that every child alike should be able to study the Bible, and, partly (as in America) of their sturdy democracy. And, let me say in passing, as proofs of the efficiency of Scotch education are to be met with all the world over, it would hardly seem that co-education can have such an emasculating effect as some of its opponents would have us believe. Even in England there are at the present time over 250 secondary schools, schools, that is, that keep their pupils up to the age of 16 at least, examined and "recognised" by the Board of Education, that are co-educational in greater or less degree. In addition to the old-established schools of the Society of Friends, in several of which boys and

girls have long been brought up together, and in addition to the various schools, established by private enterprise, in which co-education has been and is being put to the test under widely different conditions of age, numbers and school life, it is not generally realised what a large number of such schools there are under public management; both old Grammar Schools in country towns which, as there did not seem to be need for two separate schools, have been restored to the original co-educational basis that many of them, undoubtedly, had at the time of the Reformation; and new County Council Schools, established on this basis from the first, chiefly, of course, in the less thickly populated districts, for reasons of economy, but in increasing numbers, as experience of co-education grows, for other and better reasons also. It is all part of the change of feeling towards the subject, so marked of late, of which I have already spoken. On the other hand, we must not claim that these facts are proof, in this any more than in many of the other countries mentioned, of a considered acceptance of co-education in its entirety; for it must be borne in mind that in many of these schools the boys and girls are only taught together in the class-room, and may either see little of each other at other times, and even be kept rigidly separated, or else left to associate or not, as they like, without supervision. In neither case is this real co-education; but even this "co-instruction," as it is now conveniently termed—the teaching of boys and girls together in the same subjects—has two direct gains; the first, that it almost necessarily implies a mixed staff, and the consequent presentation of the subject matter and handling of the classes in different ways; the other, the widening influence of the slightly different standpoint, intellectual and emotional, from which boy and girl approach the same work;

to say nothing of such indirect gain as may result from the intercourse, restricted though it be, and sense of comradeship, to which this sharing of the same work gives rise. But, in the eyes of the advocate of co-education, it is just in the restricted nature of this intercourse that the weakness of co-instruction lies. In its narrower forms, it brings the sexes together without giving them real comradeship, and so, while missing what, as I shall shortly attempt to show, is the greatest of the gains of co-education, does not escape any difficulties and dangers that it may bring. In this, as in most things, half measures are usually the least successful; and those schools are doing most for co-education in which it is most fully put into practice. But even the most timorous experiment in this direction is a beginning, and a proof of the trend of feeling showing itself in so many countries, and not least in our own. Many experiments will still be necessary, in various kinds of school, in order to lay down the lines on which co-education is best and most easily worked, and to show what mistakes have to be avoided. But, in one form or another, it is now proved at least to be possible, and we can limit the discussion to whether it is desirable; whether, that is, the gains, immediate and indirect, that we can claim for it, outweigh or not any losses and disadvantages that may be shown to be inherent in it. That is the question, then, to which we have now to turn. And, first, let me briefly set out the facts, as I see them, on which the answer must be based. What, in fact, does co-education, so far as our experience goes, prove to do?

III.

What does it do for the boy? In the first place, I have no doubt that in the earlier school

years boys get an intellectual stimulus from the presence of girls in the same class. Girls develop, both physically and mentally, more rapidly in these earlier years than boys. And though some physiologists see a danger, on this account, of boys being hurried along beyond their normal rate of progress, I confess that I see nothing but gain, if, even in the puppy stage, a boy is induced by a girl's example to find a pleasure in other than merely muscular activity, to admit other kinds of interest, to talk French and to enjoy poetry, perhaps even not to be ashamed of making it. Later on, in this matter of intellectual keenness, the boy is quite able to hold his own, and we have then to see (to this point I shall return presently) that he does not lose by being necessarily kept to the same course of work as that followed by the girl; but in the earlier years, from 9 to 15, he gains greatly, I am convinced, from the class-companionship with the girl, and the greater variety and interest that it gives to all the work at this stage.

Then, again, there is the humanising influence, all the stronger for being largely unconscious on both sides, that the presence of girls exerts on boys, not only at all times in language and manners and still weightier matters of conduct, but also, in the later years especially, in their ideas of government and methods of exerting authority; and in their general outlook on the problems of life and the ideals with which they prepare to meet them. In this, I am aware, some will see a danger rather than a gain. Of the possible danger I shall have something to say presently; here I will only say that it seems to me to be chiefly a matter of unwise or sensible conditions. And few, I believe, will deny that some such humanising influence is needed in our schools. We have to remember that, during the most

formative years of development, a boy spends more of his life at school than at home. For a large number school is the home for three-quarters of the year, but a home without mother or sisters. It is because we are blinded by custom that we do not readily realise all the loss that this means. And even if it is admitted, as I, for one, should certainly admit, that a school life such as is associated in our minds with our Public School system has advantages of its own for which it may be worth while sacrificing something of the influences of the home, yet what a gain, if the chief of these influences need not be sacrificed, and if it proves possible to keep these other advantages without having to give up this humanising element. And that is what we claim for co-education in its completest form.

But before going on to speak of the less direct results of this school companionship of the two sexes, let us first look at the girl's side of the matter. Here the gains are, I think, quite as real and even more immediate, in a sense of greater freedom and an enlargement of her horizons such as otherwise she only gets if one of a large family of brothers and sisters. The fact of a greater freedom in her daily life and work is worth much ; the feeling of it is worth still more, and makes for a healthier outlook. The common life together provides the natural corrective for the pettiness and sentimentality rife amongst girls when always thrown upon themselves and their own interests alone. The girl has as much to gain from contact with the boy's outlook on things as he from contact with hers. It is not only that girls claim the same educational advantages and opportunities as boys have long had. That claim might be satisfied in separate schools. We are coming to see that a complete education,—if it is to be, that is, in any real sense a preparation for life,—

needs something more than either sex can get alone. Each has something to give to the other that it needs, and cannot otherwise get. If the boy needs civilising by the girl, so, no less, though in another way, is the girl's nature made fuller and more human by daily contact with the boy.

And it is not only from the contact of daily and hourly intercourse with each other that the gain comes to both, but from the more normal and homelike conditions of their life, and from association with elders, as well as school-mates, of both sexes. It is not the least of the advantages of co-education that it necessitates a mixed staff, with the wider and more varied influences that this implies both for boy and girl, and the fuller and less one-sided life for the whole community.

For, after all, it is the cumulative influence of the whole school life that is the important thing. In the co-educational school there is, for boy and girl alike, the far-reaching gain of a truer and happier relationship to take the place of the phases of mutual contempt and mutual idolisation that are encouraged by separate upbringing and mutual ignorance. At the time there is the comradeship that grows from common interests and the knowledge of one another's powers; and for the future what better basis could there be for life and work together than this habit of comradeship in the work and life of school? I do not mean that it is the inevitable doom of all boys and girls who have been at school together to marry each other. But all men and women must live and work in some degree with those of the other sex, and most will marry someone. And, as our leading playwright and paradox-monger says in one of his prefaces:—"A man as intimate with his own wife as a magistrate with his clerk, or a Prime Minister with the Leader of the Opposition, is a man in ten

thousand"; and there is not so much exaggeration in the paradox after all. For at marriage most people are on the footing of foreigners, with different habits of thought and life,—differences of which they are conscious, the more annoyingly that they don't understand them. In this connection I cannot deny myself the pleasure of quoting the passage, well known as it is, from one of Robert Louis Stevenson's essays, in which he enlarges on this point. "Man is a creature (he says) who lives not upon bread alone, but principally by catchwords; and the little rift between the sexes is astonishingly widened by simply teaching one set of catchwords to the girls and another to the boys. They are taught to follow different virtues, to hate different vices, to place their ideal, even for each other, in different achievements. What should be the result of such a course? When a horse has run away, and the two flustered people in the gig have each possessed themselves of a rein, we know the end of that conveyance will be in the ditch. So, when I see a raw youth and a green girl, fluted and fiddled in a dancing measure into that most serious contract, and setting out upon life's journey with ideas so monstrously divergent, I am not suprised that some make shipwreck, but that any come to port. What the boy does almost proudly, as a manly peccadillo, the girl will shudder at as a debasing vice; what is to her the mere commonsense of tactics, he will spit out of his mouth as shameful. Through such a sea of contrarieties must this green couple steer their way; and continue to love each other; and to respect, forsooth, and be ready, when the time comes, to educate the little men and women who shall succeed to their places and perplexities."

Stevenson, like Bernard Shaw, leaves us to draw the moral for ourselves. What is the remedy

but co-education ? It is only from mutual knowledge, unbroken from childhood onwards, that the mutual sympathy, as of fellow-countrymen instead of foreigners, can grow and blossom into mutual respect, the one true basis of real and lasting comradeship, whether in the home, or in common fields of work, or in the region, beset with so many difficulties as well as delights, of friendship and of love.

IV.

But this is leading me too far, at present, from the more immediate results of co-education, and I must turn back to ask, and try to answer, the question : however real these results of co-education may be, at what cost are they bought ? For if, as we are told, on the authority of weighty names, where they are brought up together boys can't help being made effeminate and girls coarsened ; or if the presence of each sex is bound to overstimulate the other in some way, leading to physical or mental overstrain of one, and to a precocious development of the sex instincts in both ; if these statements are true, then it is plain that whatever gains there may be as well would be bought at so great a cost that it would be folly to urge co-education and criminal to put it into practice. We must look more closely, therefore, at these difficulties and dangers, fancied or real, that it seems to involve.

The only answer to such statements is an appeal to one's own experience, and there, of course, we are on debatable ground at once, as everyone brings forward a different set of facts, or what he believes to be facts, and everyone interprets his facts differently. If I roundly declare that half these fears are the merest moonshine, and that however clearly, and in whatever scientific language, the critic proves that these

things must happen, in actual practice, in the great majority of cases, they don't ; if I say that, having known a co-educational school intimately for many years, I can declare that it isn't necessarily a namby-pamby place where boys don't do any work or play decent games, and think of nothing but flirtations, nor yet one where girls are either coarse hoydens or else nervous wrecks ; it is open to him to reply that, of course, no one can be expected to incriminate himself, and that nothing will prevent him from being assured, from his knowledge of human nature, what the result must be. The value of any assertion depends on whether one believes the speaker to have not only some solid basis of experience for his statements, but also some power of judgment, and, further, to be reasonably honest ; all that he can do is to say, " This is so, or this is not so, as far as my experience goes."

I can, of course, easily imagine conditions under which co-education might produce some at least of the results urged against it. Where there is great disparity of numbers or of age—only small boys, for instance, amongst older girls,—or, what many observers have thought the weak point in American schools, an excessive preponderance of women teachers ; or where the sexes are only occasionally together, and all sorts of barriers are put, from motives of suspicion and distrust, in the way of simple and open intercourse ; or, again, when each sex is obliged to do just what the other does ;—from such conditions I should expect disappointing and even disastrous results. But then these things are not what I mean by co-education. A growing boy (we are told) must not be kept tied to a woman's apron-strings. Quite true. He mustn't always be confined to doing what his sister can do. Quite true. Nor must a girl be encouraged to do anything and

everything that a boy does. Quite true again. But this doesn't mean that a boy can't learn much from women, and isn't the better for their influence, or that three-quarters of his day's activities cannot profitably,—and, indeed, they will be naturally,—the same as his sister's, or that she cannot with advantage share the greater part of his interests and work. Nor, on the other hand, does co-education mean, as its opponents usually assume, that they must always do exactly the same things and always do them together. For my own part I am not an advocate for boys and girls playing the majority of active games, or doing the majority of sports, together. Some things most of us, I fancy, would rule out, like football and boxing, on grounds of physiology or common sense—or prejudice, if you like, to which last some may probably attribute my including hockey and cricket, as a rule, under the same bar. Not that girls can't play these games, or that they don't, like boys, need to take hard knocks. But they will give themselves plenty of knocks, and hard ones, too ; and in general they will play a better game apart. I freely present this admission to the opponents of co-education, and shall have other like admissions to make when I come to speak of classwork. I want to make very plain that by education together I don't mean identical education, either in class-room or playing field. I don't want to make boy and girl just alike ; a thing which, happily, no kind of education, good or bad, can do. But I do want them to have much in common ; and this the life and work of school allows without neglecting their special needs. There is no reason why a boy in a mixed school should not play football just as hard as in a school for boys only. If they learn to dance—and for a boy as for a girl there is no better training than the right kind of dancing—they can learn

to box as well. You would not think it lowered the qualities that won a man his V.C. if you saw him dance ; you would certainly think so if he did nothing else. And in the same way it does boy, as well as girl, nothing but good to learn to make a basket or net a hammock, and to sew and cook. The scout movement has shown the value for boys of many things that used to be considered girls' work. And, on the other side, a girl can do much that a boy does without thereby becoming coarsened in manner and language. More boy-like she will be in many ways, I hope, than the old " ladylike " ideal, now, happily, passing into the same discredit as the swearing, bullying, foul-mouthed type of boy. Every healthy girl is at heart a bit of a tomboy. We needn't be alarmed. The sigh, " Oh, I wish I were a boy," from every girl in whom this instinct isn't recognised and given its proper outlet, doesn't mean that she, like Esau, would sell her birthright for a mess of pottage, but only that she wants the boy's freedom, and to be able to do the same interesting things. Let her do so ; give her the same sort of life (and, let me add, dress her, no less than the boy, suitably for it), and there are no more such sighs, and she soon outgrows the tomboy stage and is all the better woman for having gone through it. In fact, the characteristic qualities of the sexes are not so merely skin deep that they can be entirely changed or overlaid by a common upbringing. By separation during the formative years, the distinctive qualities of either sex are apt to be exaggerated in a one-sided way, or else to remain undeveloped. It is, I am more and more convinced, when they grow up together, that boy and girl develop their whole natures, including their characteristic differences, most normally and healthily.

So this particular fear, that the sexes will spoil each other by being much together, and boys in

particular robbed of their masculinity, seems to me, given common-sense conditions, to be a very hollow bogey. It is different with the next objection raised by the physiologist, with that air of scientific certitude before which we laymen have to bow. Boy and girl, he says, develop at different rates, as is proved by statistics of physical measurements, as well as observed in our individual experience. If so, to keep them together and put them to the same work is to harm both, by overstimulating the one or understimulating the other at different periods in their development. Now this, as I said, is a much more serious objection than the other, for there is a real truth here. It would seem that up to the age of 10 or 11 there is little difference between the average boy and girl, whether in their bodily growth or in their powers. The girl is apt to be keener in the class-room, the boy in the playing-field ; but this may be due to past tradition as much as to any real difference. But during the next few years the difference is marked. The girl is for her age the more developed, physically and mentally : she is usually, for example, much the heavier, and usually also ahead in her work. After a few years the boy catches her up, and normally goes ahead, both physically and in power of application. I do not say in *wish* to work, for the girl is usually only too anxious to do her utmost, and only too easily encouraged to overstrain herself thereby, with serious consequences either at the time or afterwards. There is need of the utmost watchfulness to prevent this. We must have a sufficiently flexible curriculum to allow of some taking harder and others easier work ; and we must have, I am quite sure, no competition between the sexes in these later years, whether we allow it in the earlier or not. But if this is admitted, does it not condemn co-education out

of hand? Is it worth while discussing further something that must obviously, by this admission, be harmful to one sex or the other? Those who argue so are making the same assumption with regard to work that they are apt to make with regard to games and other occupations. It does not follow, because boy and girl are at school together, that they must always do exactly the same things. Up to the age of 15 or so we have not found reason to think that much difference need be made in the work or treatment of the two. If before that age a girl of special ability in this direction must devote extra time, say, to her music, her course of work must be lightened on some other side. But, as a rule, it is neither good nor necessary, whether for boy or girl, to make differences or to allow of specialisation in any direction before that age. On the other hand, from at least the age of 16 on I am convinced that it is to the advantage of boy and girl alike, whether separate or together, to begin to some extent to specialise along their own lines, according to natural bent and the requirements of later professional training, among which requirements, of course, are to be counted the examinations that open the door to the profession. And this, if done, allows us to guard against overstrain, whether of boys at their critical time of development, or at this later stage of girls, while at the same time insisting on boys doing their utmost at the age when they not only must, but can well do so. In a word, co-education need not, and certainly must not, mean identical education, in work any more than in games, though in class-work there is a much larger field for common effort, shared entirely at first, and to some extent throughout. To what extent, must depend on individual bent and capacity; in some kinds of work more than in others; but enough in all cases to make the class-

room influence, with the common interests and mutual respect that it gives, a very real factor in co-education. Whereas, on the other hand, to insist on boy and girl doing exactly the same work together from first to last, would be to make it, sooner or later, unsuitable for one or the other,—either insufficiently exacting for the boy, or entailing serious risk of overstrain for the girl, with results alike disastrous for the future, whether one thinks of the requirements of any department of the work of life, or of those, even more important, of future motherhood. Perhaps you think that I am unfairly belittling a girl's power of mind and body, and unfairly exalting a boy's by comparison. It is not, if so, through any conceit on my part of male superiority. Each of us has no doubt his own convictions—or prejudices, for they cannot, as yet, be much more than preconceived ideas, however scientific the terms in which we state them—on the generic differences between the mental capacities of the two sexes. Probably a generation or two of similar training will show that the differences are much smaller than we suppose. What I am now insisting on is not any differences, real or assumed, of this kind, but the physiological differences of development that we have to deal with, and the danger, in our new enthusiasm for equality of opportunity, of ignoring these too much ; the more, as most girls are, naturally, keen to make the utmost use of these opportunities, and show that they are not in any way inferior to boys, and ready, if unwisely spurred or encouraged, to do what, happily, only few boys will do—work till they drop. Here seems to me to lie a real and, considering all the consequences involved, a serious danger in woman's education. But,—and this is a point that is often overlooked,—the danger is not confined to the mixed school ; it is equally present in schools

for girls only. When boys and girls are together, it is at least more obvious, and for that very reason, perhaps, more easily guarded against; but in planning any educational scheme, it is the chief danger against which we have to guard.

V.

Some will, perhaps, be surprised that I should call this the chief danger in co-education, instead of putting first what most people suppose to be still greater dangers and difficulties,—those arising from sex itself. If I have left these to the last, it is not because I wish to ignore them. But neither do I wish to exaggerate them. So far from being insuperable, I believe that, if we handle them wisely, they are amongst the most valuable factors in education. Let me give you an example of what I mean, in saying this. It has been stated that in Germany some masters in schools in which co-instruction has been tried report that pictures illustrating classical history, and representations of ancient sculpture, have to be left unused in mixed classes, and that some subjects have to be avoided owing to the way in which, for example, in natural history, references to propagation are received. This, if true, seems to me an amazing admission of stupidity on the part of the teacher. Of course, if he hesitates and feels awkward, so will the class. If we elders are ashamed in the presence of such things, or treat them with a snigger, so will our children. It is for us to show them the better way. Children are not naturally so self-conscious until we make them so. If they have been made so by unwise treatment, the sooner we get them out of it, by more wholesome treatment of such subjects, the better for them. For heaven's sake let us have no more silly and unwholesome prudery in such things. Let us have the sculpture about our school

buildings free from concealments such as the Papal sense of indecency has always required in the galleries of the Vatican. Let us welcome the opportunities afforded not only by the teaching of plant physiology, but by the breeding of poultry and of animals, and the study of the embryology of the chicken in the egg, to give the child's knowledge of the reproduction of life the dignity of a science,—one of the ways of keeping it from ignoble association and misuse. *One* way, I say ; the best of all is the association of such knowledge, obtained as it should be first from his mother's lips, with his deeper and holiest feelings, instead of, as otherwise is too often the case, with the forbidden and the nasty. In this way school and home can work together and reinforce each other ; and if this can be done, half—nay—four-fifths of our difficulties vanish at the outset. But if it cannot always be done, if we cannot be sure of it being done, what then ? Is there no danger in the close juxtaposition of the sexes during the very years when the consciousness of sex is forcing itself upon them ? I might reply by asking if the danger is avoided in the convent and the separate school ?—if it is not thereby only increased in ways still more difficult to deal with ? But that, though a fair retort, is no sufficient answer, if it is true that in the mixed school the danger is intensified by the presence of the other sex, and by the consequent precocious stimulation, as most people imagine, of sex-consciousness. But is this the result, as a matter of fact ? You may remember a recent work by a Japanese artist, in which he writes of his impressions in England, and especially of English women, "John Bullesses," as he calls them. In the passage I am going to quote he is speaking of mixed dancing, which to a Japanese seems just as dangerous as mixed education here may seem to many of us.

He says: "It all depends on what state of mind they have. Don't you see those John Bullesses? They are mixed with boys from their early life. They are trained admirably pure. They are just like the electric wire covered with the insulating medium. Perhaps they may have a strong electricity inside of their heart, but they are quite safe." And he goes on to say that if in Japan they want to do the same, first of all they must prepare such an "insulating medium" to "cover themselves absolutely well, otherwise they might be easily drowned into the silliest infatuation." This is sound advice, and you see what he believes to be the secret of the "British patent," as he calls it: "They are mixed with boys from their early life. They are trained admirably pure." That is it. Separation will not do what can be done by training. We must give play to the human influences, instead of resorting to suppression and seclusion. In that way we are only defeating our own object. "The ultimate result (as Herbert Spencer said) of shielding men from the effects of folly is to fill the world with fools." We must trust human nature, and thereby enlist it on our side. In an American city park there is a winding road much used by motorists. The temptation to cut the corners at high speeds led to so many accidents that the authorities decided that something must be done to prevent it. Their first idea was to put a solid barrier down the middle of the road at every curve. This, of course, only caused more smashes than before, until they removed the barriers, and, instead, painted a bright red line down the centre of the road. This is said to have worked like a charm. It hit the eye at once, and each motorist kept his own side of the line, and there were no more collisions, just because it was a moral, not a physical barrier. This is what I mean by enlisting human nature on our side instead

of forcing it into opposition. By way of contrast, take as an example of the result of the other method an account of what used to be done in some of the primary schools in France, taken from a recent number of the *Revue Universitaire* (*Paris : December*, 1913) :—

" Il y a une cinqantaine d'années, dans les écoles mixtes, une ligne de partage séparait soigneusement dans la même classe les garçons des filles. Un rideau de serge verte était tiré entre les deux groupes. Le maître ou la maîtresse se montait, comme au guignol, tantôt d'un coté tantôt de l'autre, et faisait, à tour de rôle, une leçon pour Eva et une autre pour Adam. Les plus étonnés, c'étaient assurément les enfants qui se demandaient pourquoi on les séparait à l'école alors qu'ils vivaient en commun à la maison. J'ajoute que ce rideau, soi-disant gardien de bonnes moeurs, produisait le plus souvent un effet tout contraire à celui qu'on en attendait. Il éveillait plutôt des deux côtés des curiosités précoces avec la tentation de regarder ce qui passait chez le voisin ou chez la voisine."

In these two pieces of experience we have the whole philosophy of the matter ; trust (with a red line) or distrust (with a drawn curtain) in human nature,—with the natural results in either case. Not that I regard co-education as an infallible cure-all, giving immunity from all the ills that flesh is heir to in childhood and youth. To think *that*, and put a blind trust in it, would, indeed, be to live in a fool's paradise that would sooner or later reveal its snake. But we cannot avoid all dangers by running away from them, or shut them out by building barriers. (The only way to escape disease is to make the conditions of life healthy.) And so, when I say that we must trust human nature, I don't mean blindly, without attending to the environment in which we place it. We must

watch, and help when help is needed; we must not think we can try the experiment under any conditions or with just any one who offers, child or teacher; and we must be ready to give it up with those (in our experience they have been very few) who, through coming to it too late or for any other reason, may prove unsuitable. Co-education cannot be successful where the home-influences are against it, any more than in countries where the ideas of sex-morality are low. And that is why there is less force in the argument that if co-education is to be tried at all, it can best be tried in the day-school, where the risks are obviously less, and must stand or fall by the results experienced there; results which, our opponents triumphantly point out, are often disappointingly less than our claims. It is true that in the day-school the responsibility is shared in large measure with the home, which may seem at first sight no small advantage. But it is just this division, and consequent lessening, of responsibility that makes the results disappointing when, as is sometimes the case, the homes give no help, but rather the reverse, and when, in the daily going and coming, there may be a considerable part of the day for which neither is fully responsible. All which is not so much a proof that co-education, even in a day-school, is unwise, as that, where it is to be adopted, certain conditions are all-important; and among the foremost that the parents should understand and accept their responsibilities in the matter. And here the co-educational boarding-school, contrary to the common assumption, has two advantages over the day-school; the first in the greater range and weight of influence that accompany its greater responsibility; and the second, that no parents would send their children to it, who are not themselves convinced of the value of

co-education, and so ready to use their influence on the same side as the school. Recognising as we must the importance of these conditions, it is no sign of weakness in one's conviction of the value of co-education and the desirability of its utmost possible extension, if one does not desire to see every school in the country, from Eton downwards, made co-educational to-morrow. If it is to have its full value, co-education must be tried under common-sense conditions, the chief of which, in my own view, I hope I have succeeded, in this necessarily brief survey, in making clear. But, given the conditions where it can wisely be tried, I have no hesitation in saying that in most cases development, where boys and girls grow up together, is more normal and more healthy, both during the years of growth, and in the after-results.

But then, the final objection comes, what if this normal and healthy development means falling in love at an age when they ought to be concentrating all their energies on school work and examinations ? Some seem to fear that they *will* fall in love, others that they *won't*. That co-education, that is, must either mean precocious love-making between children, or that its very familiarity will destroy romance, and its comradeship take away the incentive to marriage. The prospect either way is certainly alarming enough ; but anyone who has spent days upon our Welsh or Lakeland mountains will remember how often apparent crags, half seen through a mist, prove, when one has come a few steps nearer, to be low and easily surmounted ridges. And so it is with these two bogeys. Where friendship between boy and girl is not discouraged, flirtation is not the only basis of intercourse between the sexes, and does not greatly flourish in a community where the general feeling is against it. Common

work, common interests, and the hourly intercourse of a common life, afford a normal outlet for feelings, perfectly natural and harmless in themselves, that, if thwarted, are apt to turn to silliness and worse. And in this matter of boy and girl friendship there is need rather for guidance than for alarm or repression. In this as in other things it is only possible to learn by experience ;—which does not mean that falling in love is to be included as an essential part of the school course, but that mistakes would not be so frequent or so tragic later on if all possibility of friendship were not so rigidly ruled out, or else driven into subterranean channels, at the time when the feelings, like the mind and body, must have some means of healthy exercise and training, and are most open to guidance. Freedom to make friends does not mean that boy and girl are to be encouraged to imagine that any approach to friendship between them means anything more ; the general atmosphere and life of school, as I have said, does not encourage this mistake ; and to have learnt to be friends without silliness is worth much.

And, on the other hand, although at school comradeship normally has no use for love-making, we need not fear that it will permanently oust romance. If proof were needed, even in 15 years we have had proof enough of that in the numbers of those who have been at the School who are now married, and even, in a few instances, in the marriage of old boys and girls as the development of school friendship.* And one thing is certain : school comradeship, and the wider comradeship that this brings in its train, is an excellent basis for love, when that comes. Our ideals of love and marriage have changed with our conception of woman's position and possibilities. She is no

* See Appendix III.

longer regarded as a kind of tame cat in the home, to be alternately petted and pushed out of the way. Ignorance is no longer considered her chief requirement, nor helplessness her greatest charm, as they were not so many "milestones" back. If our novels nowadays don't end with the wedding bells and the honeymoon, it is because we recognise not only that comradeship in life and its interests and ideals and work, is no less needful for a happy marriage than romance, but also that life, for the woman as well as for the man, includes much more than love. She is determined no longer to be dependent on sex for subsistence, and he finds that he needs a companion, a fellow-worker in the problems of life, even more than a mistress. For both of them personality mutual understanding and sympathy are worth more than the sexuality we seem to have been afraid we should lose if we didn't exaggerate it. We need not bother about that. Nature will see to the sex-attraction if we will look after the rest. It is our business to see to the comradeship from which alone that attraction can make a lasting union. And to this, with all that it means for the future of the race, those who have experience of co-education believe that it can contribute much, and that it will be increasingly recognised as having a great part to play in making the men and women of to-morrow, and the world in which they will live.

VI.

For this, after all, is our main concern as educators. We have not to try and frame a system of education to produce super-men any more than to produce geniuses; for though we may think to summon them from the vasty deep, somehow they won't come at our call. We have not to think only of empire-builders, but rather

of its citizens, the ordinary men and women who will compose the community, without distinction of class or sex.

And so, to follow Emerson's picturesque advice, and "hitch my waggon to a star," I will end with a confession of faith. Co-education is to me one aspect of a world-wide movement which has many aspects and many names, but is, in essence, the refusal to admit any longer the old "divine right" claims of authority, or the exhortation to be content with the station in life, whether as rich idler or unemployable of the slums, into which we find ourselves born; the claim that the individual has, as a human being, rights no less divine; and the demand for equal opportunity, which includes, amongst other things, equal opportunity of education for all. One aspect of this universal feeling is the woman's movement. I do not mean only, or even chiefly, the demand for the suffrage, but something of which that is only a symbol, a test-case: the refusal to find in the sex-function the only purpose and outlet of a woman's life; the demand for careers of their own as free and as varied as those of men; and this not merely for the sake of economic independence, but still more for the sake of the real comradeship with men that only equality can give, and the possibilities of using their powers in whatever kind of service they may find themselves best fitted for.

Much has been done already. We are no longer (openly at least) in the harem stage of regarding women, even if we haven't all, in Meredith's phrase, "doubled Cape Turk." We are gradually getting through the chattel stage. Men don't now think they can sell their wives for a shilling and a drink, as they did not so long ago. Yet still there are schools where boys learn to think of women as "slaveys," or as game to be

hunted,—meant, either way, only to serve as ministers to their pleasure. And, in consequence of such a training, there are still Universities that not only refuse to women the elementary justice of equal pay for equal work, but dare not trust them even to go about unchaperoned. If co-education could do nothing else, it is needed to change that, to change the whole mental attitude towards sex, on the part of the average Public School and 'Varsity man, and, no less on the part of school and college authorities, men and women alike, that this implies.

The two things that women need—and this is equally true whatever views we may hold on the political aspect of the woman's movement—are, firstly, freedom to work out their own salvation, in the same way as men have done and are doing, on their own lines, not necessarily the same as men's, but, equally, not necessarily excluded from following these. And, secondly, equality of intercourse, so that we may not any longer have two separate communities, with separate ideals and rival interests, as is so commonly the case between the sexes now; but the power to work at their common problems together, each sex influencing and helping the other, on a basis of mutual understanding, and, consequently, of mutual sympathy and respect. If you are satisfied that this exists already, if you hold that women have already all the freedom of opportunity and equality of intercourse that is good, whether for their sake or for ours, there is no more to be said. I am only beating the air in suggesting that co-education has, in this as well as in its more immediate results, a valuable part to play. But if you have gone with me so far, perhaps you will take the further step of admitting that these two things, freedom of development and equality of intercourse, are best and most easily begun at school.

For it is in the school more than anywhere else that the child learns the things that are specially needed in modern life, justice, comradeship, collective interest and collective action. Why should these, the greatest of the lessons that education has to teach, be incompletely learned, and remain partial and one-sided at the best, through fear of dangers that experience proves to be largely imaginary, and of difficulties that, wisely treated, become the teacher's best opportunities ?

That these dangers and difficulties, under common-sense conditions, are not insuperable in practice, and that they are far outweighed by the gains, both at the time and in their far-reaching consequences, of a common upbringing, it has been the purpose of this paper to try and show ; and that, so far from being folly to attempt it, seeing that life, far more completely in the future than in the past, must be lived and shaped by the two sexes together, it is possibly only common-sense to prepare for it together at school.

J. H. BADLEY.

BEDALES SCHOOL, PETERSFIELD.

February, 1914.

APPENDIX I.

FACTS AND FIGURES SHOWING THE EXTENT OF CO-EDUCATION IN EUROPE.

A.—On the Continent.

1.—*In Germany.*—(*a*) In most of the States, with the exception of Bavaria and Prussia, at various dates since 1901, girls of good ability, in most cases to the extent of not more than ten per cent. of the total number of pupils, have been admitted to the higher secondary schools for boys, but must be removed if they fail to pass the terminal examinations.

The total number so admitted was estimated in 1909 at 3,000.

In 1912 there were about 600 schools into which they were so admitted, chiefly at Baden, Hesse and Würtemburg.

In 1910 the Prussian Government gave permission for the Mittelschulen (*i.e.*, up to the age of 15 or 16) to receive both boys and girls, when not filled by the sex for which they were built, and instruct them together, either in all classes or in any particular class.

In 1911 there were 25,000 girls so admitted into boys' schools containing 30,000 boys (See Dr. P. Ziertmann, Frauenbildung, Heft 8 and doppelheft 9—10, 1913).

(*b*) Of the "New Schools" there are four that are co-educational from the outset, three boarding schools and one day school.

2. *In Switzerland.*—As in Germany, girls are admitted to boys' secondary schools. Several of the "New Schools" have adopted or are adopting co-education.

3.—*In Italy.*—About twenty years ago, on the suppression of many convents, a request was made, and granted, for the admission of girls into a Lycée in Turin. The experiment being successful, it was widely followed in the North of Italy; and more recently was adopted, with equal success, at Naples, and has been followed in the South. At the present time 90 per cent. of the secondary schools are open to girls; but only for purposes of instruction. Boys and girls sit on separate benches, and have little or no intercourse outside the classroom.

4.—*In Spain.*—Girls can be admitted to State Secondary Schools and Universities; but very few avail themselves of the permission. "La Institucion Libre de Ensenanza," in Madrid, founded in 1889, has always been co-educational.

5. *In France and Belgium* and *Austria-Hungary*—Scarcely any attempt at co-education has yet been made, "Il y a d'ailleurs, a l'heure qui est, en France plusieurs jeunes filles admises dans les lycées en mathématiques spéciales, et leur presence n'a pas causé le moindre trouble"

(Extract from a letter of Mme. Cruppi, in *Le Temps*, 25th November, 1913.)

In Holland.—Co-education was first allowed in 1871, and is now universal in publicly-provided secondary schools. There are separate classes only in Catholic and private schools.

In Norway, Sweden and Denmark.—The first co-educational private school (the "Palmgrenska Samskola") was opened in Stockholm in 1876. Co-education was adopted in Norway in all State schools in 1896, more recently in Denmark and Sweden; and is now universal in these countries, except for a few private separate schools.

In Finland.—The first mixed secondary school was opened in 1880. In 1910 there were 72 mixed schools, staffed by an equal number of men and women. Twenty-three per cent. of the matriculants at the University are women. (In Germany in 1912 only 4 per cent. of the University students were women.)

B.—In Great Britain.

In England.—(*a*) In reply to a question asked in the House of Commons, March 27th, 1913, the answer was given that there were then 258 secondary schools (as against 232 in 1910) recognised as efficient by the Board of Education in which boys and girls were taught together in all or some forms.

These schools contained 40,000 pupils, and represented 23 per cent. of the total number.

(*b*) There are about twenty co-educational secondary schools not under public control.

In Wales.—In 1910, of 109 schools recognised as efficient, 59 were mixed, 25 for boys only, and 25 for girls only.

In Scotland.—In 1913, of 57 secondary schools receiving the highest grant, 40 were mixed, 11 for boys only, and 6 for girls only.

Of the 195 higher grade schools in Scotland, 186 were open to both sexes.

An enquiry addressed to the School Boards of all populous places in Scotland elicited the following facts:—All secondary and higher grade schools built or rebuilt in the last four or five years are open to both sexes, and those about to be built will also be so, even in places where there are already two or more

such schools. Within the school the pupils are taught both in mixed and separate classes as the Headmaster may see fit, but in all schools some mixed classes are formed. When numbers are very great, as in the Junior Grade, separate classes are not infrequently formed.

It is chiefly in Glasgow, Aberdeen and Dundee that separate schools have been established. At Aberdeen the most recently erected higher grade school is a mixed school. In the higher grade schools of Dundee boys and girls are admitted as scholars, but except in the highest classes they are taught separately. At Edinburgh the Board has never provided separate schools for boys and girls, and no such policy is contemplated. At Perth, after an enquiry held three years ago, as to the merits of the mixed and separate systems, a third mixed secondary school is about to be erected.

NOTE :—Most of the above facts and figures were collected by Lt.-Colonel Curtis for the British Institute of Social Service, 1, Central Buildings, Tothill Street, Westminster, to whom I am greatly indebted for the information placed at my disposal.

The Institute has a complete Bibliography, arranged geographically and chronologically, upon the subject of Co-education, which can be seen by anyone interested in the subject.

APPENDIX II.

I do not give statistics of American Schools, as, in order to make them of any value, it would be necessary :—

(*a*) To give them separately for the Eastern States, the Centre and the West ;

(*b*) To give separately those for the great cities ;

(*c*) To add notes as to the local conditions in each case ; and for this purpose I have not sufficient or sufficiently recent available figures.

It may, however, throw some light on the suggestion made in the text that one of the factors in bringing about the change from co-educational to separate schools is the enormous size to which the public schools tend to grow in the great cities, with the consequent difficulty in the way of the supervision and personal influence that co-education needs, to compare the following figures for the year 1908 :—

I.—In the Public Mixed Schools.

Number of Schools	8904
,, ,, Scholars	726000
Average number of Scholars per school	81.5

II.—*In the Public Separate Schools.*

(*a*) *For Boys Only.*

Number of Schools	33
,, ,, Boys	21936
Average number of boys per school ...	664

(*b*) *For Girls Only.*

Number of Schools	23
,, ,, Girls	22824
Average number of girls per school ...	992

(See Dr. P. Ziertmann : Die gemeinsane Erziehung von Knaben und Mädchen in Deutschland und in Amerika : Leipzig, 1909).

APPENDIX III.

MARRIAGE OF BEDALES BOYS AND GIRLS.

As something that I said at the meeting where this paper was read seems to have been misunderstood, it may be well to give the facts and figures on which the answer was based. In reply to a question as to the proportion of our old boys and girls who are married, I said that I had only investigated the matter as far as concerned the girls, of whom one-third were married, and of these, again, about one-third had married old schoolfellows. This statement was afterwards made the subject of a note in the *Daily Express* as follows :—

" Co-education is evidently no bar to marriage. Of 400 girls who have passed through Bedales during the 15 years of its existence, one-third have since married, and of these one-third again, roughly 45, have married old schoolmates."

How the reporter got his figures I do not know. Divide them by ten, and they are something like correct ! In arriving at my own figures, as the point of such an enquiry is to see what effect a co-educational upbringing has upon marriage, I laid down for myself two conditions :—

1. Only those girls to be considered who had stayed in the School *at least* two years, and had completed their school course here.

2. Those who are still at College, or training elsewhere, are not included, any more than those still at school.

Given these conditions the figures are as follows :—

Total number of girls considered	...	42	Percentage 100
,, ,, ,, marriages ...	...	14	,, 33·3
Number who have married schoolfellows		4	,, 9·5

DATE DUE

AUG 6 1973 F			
[illegible] 5 1974 S			
[illegible]			
[illegible]			
DEC [illegible] 1 7			
AUG 2 [illegible] 1993			
JUN 2 3 1999			
JUL 2 1 2004			
GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.